



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/995,726	11/29/2001	Andrew William Hull	PN01002AA/10-34	1851

23400 7590 05/22/2003

POSZ & BETHARDS, PLC  
11250 ROGER BACON DRIVE  
SUITE 10  
RESTON, VA 20190

EXAMINER
----------

LE, LANA N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2685

DATE MAILED: 05/22/2003

3

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/995,726	HULL, ANDREW WILLIAM	
	Examiner Lana Le	Art Unit 2685	(1)
<b>-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --</b>			
<b>Period for Reply</b>			
<b>A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.</li> <li>- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.</li> <li>- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.</li> <li>- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).</li> <li>- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).</li> </ul>			
<b>Status</b>			
1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>29 November 2001</u> .			
2a) <input type="checkbox"/> This action is <b>FINAL</b> .		2b) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> This action is non-final.	
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.			
<b>Disposition of Claims</b>			
4) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) <u>1-21</u> is/are pending in the application.			
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.			
5) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) <u>11-21</u> is/are allowed.			
6) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) <u>1-10</u> is/are rejected.			
7) <input type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.			
8) <input type="checkbox"/> Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.			
<b>Application Papers</b>			
9) <input type="checkbox"/> The specification is objected to by the Examiner.			
10) <input type="checkbox"/> The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) <input type="checkbox"/> accepted or b) <input type="checkbox"/> objected to by the Examiner.			
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
11) <input type="checkbox"/> The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) <input type="checkbox"/> approved b) <input type="checkbox"/> disapproved by the Examiner.			
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.			
12) <input type="checkbox"/> The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.			
<b>Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120</b>			
13) <input type="checkbox"/> Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).			
a) <input type="checkbox"/> All b) <input type="checkbox"/> Some * c) <input type="checkbox"/> None of:			
1. <input type="checkbox"/> Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.			
2. <input type="checkbox"/> Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.			
3. <input type="checkbox"/> Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).			
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.			
14) <input type="checkbox"/> Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).			
a) <input type="checkbox"/> The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.			
15) <input type="checkbox"/> Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.			
<b>Attachment(s)</b>			
1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.	
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)	
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.		6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.	

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which the subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1-3 and 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alperovich et al (US 6,233,448) in view of Liu (US 5,825,759).

Regarding claim 1, Alperovich et al discloses a method of controlling service acquisition in a wireless local area network (WLAN) device, the method including the steps of:

determining a parameter that corresponds to a present environment for the wireless device (col 4, lines 33-36; col 6, lines 58-62);  
comparing the parameter to a predetermined value to provide a comparison, the predetermined value defining, in part, an environment (activation location) where service for the WLAN device is desirable (col 3, line 65- col 4, line 3);  
analyzing the comparison according to a rule to provide a decision (col 6, lines 62-65);  
enabling a service acquisition mode when the decision is favorable (col 4, lines 36-41);  
and foregoing the service acquisition mode when the decision is unfavorable (col 7, lines 7-13). Alperovich et al didn't further disclose a WLAN device. Liu discloses a WLAN device (col 4, lines 54-64; col 3, lines 23-40). It would have been obvious to one

of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the mobile cellular device of Alperovich et al with the WLAN device in order to apply the procedures above to a wireless local area network as well as the cellular network system.

Regarding claim 2, Alperovich et al further discloses the method of claim 1 wherein the step of determining a parameter includes determining a location of the WLAN device (col 4, lines 33-36).

Regarding claim 3, Alperovich et al further discloses the method of claim 2 wherein the determining the location uses one of a cellular zone ID, a global position system (GPS) signal, and a signal strength measurement (col 6, lines 53-55; col 3, lines 28-34).

Regarding claim 8, Alperovich et al further discloses the method of claim 1 further including a step of providing the predetermined value for the WLAN device (col 4, lines 61-67).

Regarding claim 9, Alperovich et al further discloses the method of claim 8 wherein providing the predetermined value includes programming the WLAN device with one of a location, time, and state (col 4, lines 16-26).

Regarding claim 10, Alperovich et al further discloses the method of claim 8 wherein providing the predetermined value includes memorizing one of a location, time, and state when service has been acquired (col 7, lines 39-50).

2. Claims 4-5, 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alperovich et al in view of Liu as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Jyogataki et al (US 6,192,251).

Regarding claim 4, Alperovich and Liu further discloses the method of claim 1 wherein they fail to further disclose the step of determining a parameter includes determining a time at the WLAN device. Jyogataki et al further discloses disclose the step of determining a parameter includes determining a time at the WLAN device (col 11 lines 35-40; col 5, lines 42-56). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to determine a time parameter in order to compare the current time with a preset time to detect when the mobile enters the certain service area.

Regarding claim 5, Alperovich and Liu further discloses the method of claim 1 wherein the they fail to further disclose the step of determining a parameter includes determining a state relevant to the WLAN device. Jyogataki et al further discloses the step of determining a parameter includes determining a state relevant to the WLAN device (col 11, line 66 – col 12, line 9; col 11, lines 19-35). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to determine a parameter based on a certain state in order to set and characterize the comparison data with a predetermined threshold.

Regarding claim 7, Alperovich and Liu further discloses the method of claim 1 wherein they didn't further disclose the step of determining a parameter includes determining a combination of location, time, and state for the WLAN device. Jyogataki

further discloses the step of determining a parameter includes determining a combination of location, time, and state for the WLAN device (col 5, lines 33-56). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to determine a parameter such as time, location, and state in order to define a condition to match a predetermined state with the current state.

2. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Alperovich et al in view of Liu in view of Jyogataki et al as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Moore et al (US 6,434,381).

Regarding claim 6, Alperovich et al, Liu and Jyogataki et al further discloses the method of claim 5 wherein they didn't further disclose the determining the state includes one of detecting a need for service and a reference to a schedule database. Moore et al further discloses the determining the state includes one of detecting a need for service and a reference to a schedule database (col 3, lines 32-48). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to detect a need for service and refer to a schedule database in order to determine if a particular service is desired and to access the mobile's memory to obtain the information needed from a stored menu category.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

3. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

Regarding independent claim 11, Alperovich discloses a wireless mobile device arranged and constructed to control service acquisition comprising in combination: a user input output (I/O) interface for interacting with a user (col 4, lines 25-32); determining a parameter that corresponds to a present environment for the WLAN device (col 4, lines 33-36; col 6, lines 58-62); comparing the parameter to a predetermined value to provide a comparison, the predetermined value defining, in part, an environment where service for the WLAN device is desirable (col 3, line 65 – col 4, line 3); analyzing the comparison according to a rule to provide a decision (col 6, lines 62-65); enabling the service acquisition mode when the decision is favorable (col 4, lines 36-41); and foregoing the service acquisition mode when the decision is unfavorable (col 7, lines 7-13).

Alperovich et al didn't further disclose a WLAN device. Liu discloses a WLAN device (col 4, lines 54-64; col 3, lines 23-40). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the mobile cellular device of Alperovich et al with the WLAN device in order to apply the procedures above to a wireless local area network as well as the cellular network system.

However, Alperovich et al and Liu didn't further disclose: a transceiver for coupling to a second telecommunication device; and a controller, coupled to the user I/O and the transceiver, for deciding whether the transceiver will enter a service acquisition mode thereby coupling to the second telecommunication device.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

***Conclusion***

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Peters et al (US 6,397,072) Service means to provide a service to a user, method realized by such a service means and a telecommunication network including such a service means.

- Hendrey et al (US 6539232) Method and system for connecting mobile users based on degree of separation.

- Kuwahara et al (US 6389288) Mobile communication terminal capable of executing location-related services.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lana Le whose telephone number is (703) 308-5836. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward Urban can be reached on (703) 305-4385. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9314 for regular communications and (703) 872-9315 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4750.



Lana Le

May 16, 2003



EDWARD F. URBAN  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600